

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 30 2006

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 28, 2006, claims 1-30, 32 and 33 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-10 are withdrawn. The allowability of claims 24 and 25, if rewritten in independent form, is acknowledged. Claims 12 and 33 have been cancelled. Claims 11, 13, 15, 18, 22-28, and 30 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections.

Claims 11, 14-17, 27-30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious in view of Szabo, U.S. Patent No. 7,040,722. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 11 requires a step of determining a slip ratio in response to an applied torque which the Office Action acknowledges is not disclosed or suggested in the Szabo reference. Similarly, independent claim 15 requires that the wheel lift status is to be determined in response to a change in wheel speed and a reacceleration threshold which the Office Action acknowledges is not disclosed or suggested in the Szabo reference. Accordingly, independent claim 11 and dependent claims 13 and 14 are in a condition for allowance in view of Szabo. As well, independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16-26 are also allowable in view of Szabo.

Independent claims 27, 28 and 30 also require a determination of a slip ratio for wheel slip which, as noted above, is not disclosed or suggested in the Szabo reference. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Szabo.

With regard to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), in view of Holst, U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037677, Applicants also traverse. With regard to independent claims 11, 27, 28 and 30 which all require determining a slip ratio or wheel slip, Applicants traverse the suggestion in the Office Action that Holst discloses this feature. The Office Action refers to paragraph [0038] of Holst as disclosing a determination of a slip ratio in response to an applied pressure or torque. Applicants have reviewed the Holst disclosure and, in particular, paragraph [0038] and can find no teaching or suggestion for this feature. To the contrary, the method of Holst is summarized in paragraph [0038] as monitoring the rotational speed differences between the wheels on the inside of the curve and those on the outside of the curve during a test

braking force, and using these velocities in the equations provided to determine transverse acceleration signals for the inside wheels and outside wheels. There is no mention or suggestion of Applicants' claimed slip ratio or wheel slip. Accordingly, the rejections with respect to independent claims 11 and 30 and all claims dependent thereon should be withdrawn.

Similarly, Applicants traverse the suggestion in the Office Action that paragraph [0038] discloses Applicants' claimed reacceleration threshold (claim 15). There is no teaching or suggestion whatsoever of a reacceleration threshold or a reacceleration reference velocity as set forth in claims 22-26. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 11, 13-15, 18-23, 26, 30 and 32 in view of Holst.


Finally, with regard to the antecedent basis objections set forth in paragraphs 4-9 of the Office Action, Applicants have made clarifying amendments to claims 19 and 22-26 to provide a proper antecedent basis for all features recited therein.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all rejections and objections are now overcome and that the application is in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance indicating the allowability of claims 11, 13-30 and 32 is therefore earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney if any unresolved matters remain or if the Examiner has any comments which would place the application in a better condition for allowance.

A Notice of Extension of Time (one month) accompanies this paper. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 06-1510 or, if that account lacks sufficient funds, use deposit account 06-1505.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.


Robert P. Renke, Reg. No. 40,783
Attorney for Applicants
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: October 30, 2006